



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/722,681	11/25/2003	Matthew B. Shoemake	TI-35728	8351
23494 7590 10/29/2007 TEXAS INSTRUMENTS INCORPORATED P O BOX 655474, M/S 3999 DALLAS, TX 75265			EXAMINER DAO, MINH D	
			ART UNIT 2618	PAPER NUMBER
			NOTIFICATION DATE 10/29/2007	DELIVERY MODE ELECTRONIC

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

uspto@ti.com
uspto@dlemail.itg.ti.com

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/722,681

Applicant(s)

SHOEMAKE ET AL.

Examiner

MINH D. DAO

Art Unit

2618

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 14 August 2007.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-21 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-21 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
- ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 - ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 - ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
- 6) ☐ Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

Response to Arguments

1. Applicant's arguments filed 08/14/07 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

2. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

1. Claims 1-21 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Awater et al. (US 7,046,649) in view of Eitan et al. (US 6,882,635).

Regarding claim 1, Awater teaches a dual platform communication controller for use with a wireless communication system (see fig. 1), comprising: a signal interpreter coupled to said wireless communication system and configured to recognize a first signal packet based on a first communication standard and a second signal packet based on a second communication standard (see figs. 1 and 2; col. 3, line 10 to col. 4, line 60); and a traffic manager coupled to said signal interpreter and configured to provide a deterministic time-sharing between said first and second signal packets within said wireless communication system (see figs. 1 and 2; col. 5, line 15 to col. 6, line 57).

Art Unit: 2618

The control means and the Interoperability device 106 of Awater read on the signal interpreter and the traffic manager of the present invention. However, Awater does not disclose prohibit interrupting a transmission of the second signal packet when the signal interpreter recognizes the first signal packet. Eitan, in an analogous art, teaches a method for preventing interference between electromagnetic signals, including: toggling a first transceiver, adapted to transmit in a first EM frequency band, and a second transceiver, adapted to transmit in a second EM frequency band, different from the first EM frequency band, between an on-period when the first transceiver is able to transmit and the second transceiver is prevented from transmitting, and an off-period when the first transceiver is prevented from transmitting and the second transceiver is able to transmit (see col. 3, lines 1-42). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skilled in the art at the time of the invention was made to provide the above teaching of Eitan to Awater in order for the combined collocated system to avoid interference as taught by Eitan.

Regarding claim 2, the combination of Awater and Eitan teaches the controller as recited in claim 1 wherein the first communication standard is configured to be IEEE 802.11 (see Awater, figs. 1 and 2; col. 3, line 10 to col. 4, line 60).

Regarding claim 3, the combination of Awater and Eitan teaches the controller as recited in claim 1 wherein said second communication standard is configured to be Bluetooth (see Awater, figs. 1 and 2; col. 3, line 10 to col. 4, line 60).

Regarding claim 4, the combination of Awater and Eitan teaches the controller as recited in claim 1 wherein said traffic manager is configured to provide said deterministic time-sharing between said first and second signal packets based on a real-time requirement (see Awater, figs. 1 and 2; col. 3, line 10 to col. 4, line 60).

Regarding claim 5, the combination of Awater and Eitan teaches the controller as recited in claim 1 wherein said traffic manager is configured to provide said deterministic time-sharing between said first and second signal packets based on a period of time (see Awater, figs. 1 and 2; col. 3, line 10 to col. 4, line 60).

Regarding claim 6, the combination of Awater and Eitan teaches the controller as recited in claim 1 wherein said traffic manager is configured to provide said deterministic time-sharing between said first and second signal packets by inhibiting a transmission capability of at least one of said first and second signal packets (see Awater, figs. 1 and 2; col. 3, line 10 to col. 4, line 60; also see col. 5, line 15 to col. 6, line 57).

Regarding claim 7, the combination of Awater and Eitan teaches that the controller as recited in claim 1 wherein said traffic manager is further configured to operate in a default state having a listening mode and a standby mode (see col. 1, line 51 to col. 2, line 13). Since Awater teaches a CSMA/CA (Carrier Sense Multiple Access with the use

Art Unit: 2618

of Collision Avoidance) that is well known in the art to "listen-before-talk", therefore this teaching of Awater obviously reads on the above limitation of the present invention.

Regarding claim 8, the claim includes the limitations as that of claim 1, and therefore is interpreted and rejected for the reason set forth in the rejection of claim 1.

Regarding claim 9, the claim includes the limitations as that of claim 2, and therefore is interpreted and rejected for the reason set forth in the rejection of claim 2.

Regarding claim 10, the claim includes the limitations as that of claim 3, and therefore is interpreted and rejected for the reason set forth in the rejection of claim 3.

Regarding claim 11, the claim includes the limitations as that of claim 4, and therefore is interpreted and rejected for the reason set forth in the rejection of claim 4.

Regarding claim 12, the claim includes the limitations as that of claim 5, and therefore is interpreted and rejected for the reason set forth in the rejection of claim 5.

Regarding claim 13, the claim includes the limitations as that of claim 6, and therefore is interpreted and rejected for the reason set forth in the rejection of claim 6.

Art Unit: 2618

Regarding claim 14, the claim includes the limitations as that of claim 7, and therefore is interpreted and rejected for the reason set forth in the rejection of claim 7.

Regarding claim 15, the claim includes the limitations as that of claim 1, and therefore is interpreted and rejected for the reason set forth in the rejection of claim 1.

Regarding claim 16, the claim includes the limitations as that of claim 2, and therefore is interpreted and rejected for the reason set forth in the rejection of claim 2.

Regarding claim 17, the claim includes the limitations as that of claim 3, and therefore is interpreted and rejected for the reason set forth in the rejection of claim 3.

Regarding claim 18, the claim includes the limitations as that of claim 4, and therefore is interpreted and rejected for the reason set forth in the rejection of claim 4.

Regarding claim 19, the claim includes the limitations as that of claim 5, and therefore is interpreted and rejected for the reason set forth in the rejection of claim 5.

Regarding claim 20, the claim includes the limitations as that of claim 6, and therefore is interpreted and rejected for the reason set forth in the rejection of claim 6.

Art Unit: 2618

Regarding claim 21, the claim includes the limitations as that of claim 7, and therefore is interpreted and rejected for the reason set forth in the rejection of claim 7.

Conclusion

2. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire **THREE MONTHS** from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within **TWO MONTHS** of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the **THREE-MONTH** shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than **SIX MONTHS** from the date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to MINH D. DAO whose telephone number is 571-272-7851. The examiner can normally be reached on 8:30 AM - 5:00 PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, MATTHEW ANDERSON can be reached on 571-272-4177. The fax phone

Art Unit: 2618

number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

MINH DAO *md*
AU 2618



MATTHEW ANDERSON
SUPERVISER AU 2618